arXiv:1604.07867v1 [math.CO] 26 Apr 2016

Spectral threshold dominance, Brouwer's conjecture and maximality of Laplacian energy

Christoph Helmberg* Vilmar Trevisan†

April 28, 2016

Abstract

The Laplacian energy of a graph is the sum of the distances of the eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix of the graph to the graph's average degree. The maximum Laplacian energy over all graphs on n nodes and m edges is conjectured to be attained for threshold graphs. We prove the conjecture to hold for graphs with the property that for each k there is a threshold graph on the same number of nodes and edges whose sum of the k largest Laplacian eigenvalues exceeds that of the k largest Laplacian eigenvalues of the graph. We call such graphs spectrally threshold dominated. These graphs include split graphs and cographs and spectral threshold dominance is preserved by disjoint unions and taking complements. We conjecture that all graphs are spectrally threshold dominated. This conjecture turns out to be equivalent to Brouwer's conjecture concerning a bound on the sum of the k largest Laplacian eigenvalues.

Keywords: Laplacian Energy, threshold graph, Brouwer conjecture, Grone-Merris-Bai Theorem

MSC 2010: 05C50, 05C35

1 Introduction

Let $G = (N, E)$ be a simple graph with node set $N = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and edge set $E \subseteq \{\{i, j\} : i, j \in N, i \neq j\}$. For brevity, we will usually write ij instead of $\{i, j\}$ for edges and put $m = |E|$. It will be convenient to assume that the nodes are numbered so that their degrees $d_i = |\{j : ij \in E\}|$ are sorted nonincreasingly. Let e_i denote the i-th column of the $n \times n$ identity matrix I_n and define the positive semidefinite matrices $E_{ij} := (e_i - e_j)(e_i - e_j)^T$, then the Laplacian matrix of G is defined to be $L(G) = \sum_{ij \in E} E_{ij}$. $L(G)$ may also be written as $L(G) = D(G) - A(G)$, where $D(G)$ is the diagonal degree matrix and $A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix of G. If G is clear from the context, we drop the argument and simply write L. The Laplacian is a positive semidefinite matrix with a trivial eigenvalue 0 and the vector of all ones $\mathbf{1}$ as associated eigenvector. In this paper we denote the eigenvalues of L in nonincreasing order by $\lambda_1(L) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{n-1}(L) \geq \lambda_n(L) = 0$. As the trace of L is $2m$ there holds $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda_i(L) = 2m$ and for $m > 0$ at least one eigenvalue has value greater than the average degree $2m/n$. The eigenvalues of L are the Laplacian eigenvalues of G and we may write $\lambda_i(L) = \lambda_i(G)$.

*Fakultät für Mathematik, Technische Universität Chemnitz, D-09107 Chemnitz, Germany. helmberg@mathematik.tu-chemnitz.de

†Instituto de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, CEP 91509-900, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil. trevisan@mat.ufrgs.br

The Laplacian energy of a graph G is defined to be

$$LE(G) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left| \lambda_i(G) - \frac{2m}{n} \right|$$

and [2] raised the question which graphs on n nodes maximize this value.

For $i = 1, \ldots, n$ the conjugate degree $d_i^*(G) = |\{i\colon d_i \geq i\}|$ gives the number of nodes of G of degree at least i. Each degree sequence satisfying $d_i^* = d_i + 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, f$ with *trace* $f = \max\{i\colon d_i \geq i\}$ uniquely defines a graph and these graphs form the so called threshold graphs [9]. We notice that the degree sequence d of threshold graphs is fully specified once the conjugate degrees d_i^* are given for $i \in [f]$, which is easily seen by looking at a Ferrers diagram of d (see next section for definitions). There the part strictly below the diagonal boxes is the transpose of the part above and including the diagonal. The right hand side of Figure 2 is the Ferrers diagram of the (threshold) graph corresponding to the degree sequence $d = (4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 0, 0, 0)$. The dual degrees give the number of boxes of the columns. Threshold graphs may also be characterized combinatorially by starting with the empty graph and iteratively adding a node that is isolated or fully connected to all previous nodes.

In our context, a central property of threshold graphs T is that the conjugate degrees are exactly the eigenvalues of their Laplacian matrix, $\lambda_i(T) = d_i^*(T)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ [8]. It has been conjectured that among all connected graphs on n nodes the threshold graph called pineapple with trace $\lfloor \frac{2n}{3} \rfloor$ maximizes the Laplacian energy (see [11]). Among connected threshold graphs the pineapple is indeed the maximizer; for general threshold graphs on n nodes the clique of size $\lfloor \frac{2n+1}{3} \rfloor + 1$ together with $\lfloor \frac{n-3}{3} \rfloor$ isolated vertices is a threshold graph maximizing Laplacian energy [6] and we conjecture that this graph has maximum Laplacian energy among all graphs on n nodes.

In this paper we prove that the general conjecture holds for graphs that are spectrally dominated by threshold graphs in the following sense.

Definition 1 *A graph G on n nodes with m edges is* spectrally threshold dominated *if for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ there is a threshold graph T_k having the same number of nodes and edges satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(T_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T_k) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$.*

This definition was in part motivated by the Grone-Merris conjecture, proved by Bai [1] – from here on called the Grone-Merris-Bai Theorem – which states that for any graph G on n vertices with degree sequence $d_1 \geq \ldots \geq d_n$ and for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(G). \tag{1}$$

Note that equality holds in (1) for threshold graphs.

Our main result (proved in Section 2) is the following.

Theorem 2 *For each spectrally threshold dominated graph G there exists a threshold graph with the same number of nodes and edges whose Laplacian energy is at least as large as that of G.*

We conjecture that all graphs are spectrally threshold dominated, in which case the maximum Laplacian energy would be attained by threshold graphs for any given number of nodes and edges. We prove that this class goes well beyond threshold graphs (definitions of the graph classes will be given along with the proofs in Section 3 and Section 4).

Theorem 3 *Split graphs are spectrally threshold dominated.*

Theorem 4 *Disjoint unions and complements of spectrally threshold dominated graphs are spectrally threshold dominated.*

This has the following immediate consequence.

Corollary 5 *Cographs are spectrally threshold dominated.*

The search for further examples of graph classes whose sum of the k largest Laplacian eigenvalues can be bounded by threshold graphs leads to Brouwer's conjecture. It is related to (and motivated by) the Grone-Merris conjecture [5] and states that for any graph G on n vertices and m edges,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G) \leq m + \binom{k+1}{2}. \tag{2}$$

One may ask whether the bound given by the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem is sharper than Brouwer's conjecture, because it uses more detailed information from the graph. Indeed, it has been shown in [7] that for split graphs this is the case. However, more generally, it is shown that there is a k such that the k-th inequality of Brouwer's conjecture is sharper than the k-th Grone-Merris inequality if and only if the graph is non-split. Brouwer's conjecture remains unproven to this date.

It turns out (see Section 5) that Brouwer's conjecture is, in fact, equivalent to spectral threshold dominance.

Theorem 6 *A graph G satisfies Brouwer's conjecture if and only if it is spectrally threshold dominated.*

Quite likely this relation to threshold graphs has been part of the motivation for Brouwer's conjecture. Recognizing this equivalence also opens the door to previous, rather different proofs of Theorem 3, Theorem 4, and Corollary 5 by [7], who proved that Brouwer's conjecture holds in these cases.

Establishing Brouwer's conjecture would prove the Laplacian energy conjecture in the non connected case. The requirement of spectral threshold dominance is, however, stronger than needed for the Laplacian energy conjecture. A counterexample for Brouwer's conjecture might not be sufficient to disprove the Laplacian energy conjecture. On the other hand, a counterexample for the non connected Laplacian energy conjecture would immediately disprove the spectral threshold dominance conjecture and thus also Brouwer's conjecture.

2 Spectral threshold dominance and Laplacian energy

Before embarking on the proof of Theorem 2 we illustrate spectral threshold dominance by an example involving cycles (these are neither cographs nor split graphs). Note that in the definition of spectral threshold dominance, the threshold graph is allowed to depend on G and k. In the example, we are able to supply a single threshold graph that spectrally dominates G for all values of k.

Our constructions here and later are inspired by the characterization of threshold graphs by their Ferrers (or Young) diagram (see for example [9]) of their nonincreasing degree sequence.

Given a degree sequence $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \cdots \geq d_n$ of a graph G, its Ferrers diagram consists of n rows, where row i displays d_i boxes aligned on the left. The conjugate degree sequence d_i^* may be read off from the Ferrers diagram by simply counting the number of boxes in the i-the column. The diagonal width of the degree sequence $f = \max\{i \in N \colon d_i \geq i\}$ is called the *trace* of the diagram.

For threshold graphs, as $d_i^* = d_i + 1$, it means that in each row $i \in [f]$, the number of boxes on and to the right of the diagonal box is the same as the number of boxes in column i below the diagonal. More generally, the shape described by the boxes on and above the diagonal is exactly the transpose of the shape of the boxes below the diagonal. The f boxes on the diagonal will be displayed in black.



Figure 1: C_8 and its Ferrers diagram

Example 7 *Figure 1 depicts the cycle C_8 on 8 vertices and its Ferrers diagram, while Figure 2 shows a threshold graph that spectrally dominates C_8 for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, 8\}$. Indeed the spectrum of C_8 is the multiset $\{4, 2+\sqrt{2}, 2+\sqrt{2}, 2, 2, 2-\sqrt{2}, 2-\sqrt{2}, 0\}$ whose partial sums are $4, 6+\sqrt{2}, 8+2\sqrt{2}, 10+2\sqrt{2}, 12+2\sqrt{2}, 14+\sqrt{2}, 16, 16$, whereas the partial sums for the eigenvalues of the threshold graph of Figure 2 are $5, 10, 14, 16, 16, 16, 16, 16$. Notice that the resulting threshold graph is disconnected.*



Figure 2: A spectrally threshold dominant graph of C_8

This procedure can be generalized for a general cycle C_n on n vertices. Indeed consider C_n with $n \geq 8$ vertices (hence with $m = n \geq 8$ edges). Let $h = \lfloor \sqrt{2n} \rfloor$. We observe that $2n - (h^2 - h) \geq h$ and $2n - (h^2 + h) \leq h + 1$. Define T to be the threshold graph whose Ferrers diagram has Durfee square (trace) $f = h - 1$, if $2n - (h^2 + h) < 0$, otherwise T will have trace $f = h$. The remaining boxes will be placed as a last $(f+1)$th-column (half of them) and the corresponding last $(f+2)$th-row in the Ferrers diagram. As the Laplacian spectrum of C_n is the set $\{2 - 2\cos\frac{2\pi}{n}i \colon i = 1, \ldots, n\}$ we observe that for $i = 1, \ldots, f$, $\lambda_i(C_n) \leq 4 = \sqrt{2 \cdot 8} =$

$\lfloor\sqrt{2\cdot 8}\rfloor \leq \lfloor\sqrt{2\cdot n}\rfloor \leq \lambda_i(T)$. *Hence it holds that* $\sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(C_n) \leq 4\cdot k \leq h\cdot k \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(T)$, *for* $k=1,\ldots,f$. *If* $k \geq f$, *we observe that* $\sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(T) = 2n = 2m \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(C_n)$.

The Laplacian energy of a graph G is actually fully determined by the sum of the k eigenvalues whose values exceed the average degree $\frac{2m}{n}$. For providing a threshold graph T on the same number of nodes and edges with the same or higher Laplacian energy it suffices to find one with $\sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(G)$ for this specific k, as proved in the following lemma.

Lemma 8 *Let* G *be a graph on* n *nodes with* m *edges and conjugate degree sequence* d_i^*, $i=1,\ldots,n$ *and let* $k \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$ *be the index satisfying* $\lambda_k(G) > \frac{2m}{n} \geq \lambda_{k+1}(G)$. *Any threshold graph* T *on* n *nodes with* m *edges satisfying* $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(G)$ *also satisfies* $LE(T) \geq LE(G)$.

Proof By $\sum_{i=0}^{n}\lambda_i(G) = 2m$ there holds $\sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\lambda_i(G) = 2m - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(G)$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
LE(G) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}|\lambda_i(G) - \tfrac{2m}{n}| \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k}(\lambda_i(G) - \tfrac{2m}{n}) + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n}(\tfrac{2m}{n} - \lambda_i(G)) \\
&= 2\sum_{i=1}^{k}\lambda_i(G) - 2m - k\tfrac{2m}{n} + (n-k)\tfrac{2m}{n} \\
&= 2\sum_{i=1}^{k}(\lambda_i(G) - \tfrac{2m}{n}) \\
&\leq 2\sum_{i=1}^{k}(d_i^*(T) - \tfrac{2m}{n}) \\
&= 2\sum_{i=1}^{k}(\lambda_i(T) - \tfrac{2m}{n}) \\
&\leq 2\sum_{i\in\{j\colon \lambda_j(T) > \frac{2m}{n}\}}(\lambda_i(T) - \tfrac{2m}{n}) = LE(T).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equation follows by repeating the initial arguments on G for T. □

If a graph is spectrally threshold dominated, an appropriate threshold graph T_k exists for all k, in particular for the k required in Lemma 8. This proves Theorem 2.

3 Split graphs are spectrally threshold dominated

Recall that G is a split graph if its set of vertices can be partitioned in two sets A and B such that A induces a clique in G and B does not contain any edge. The key for proving that split graphs are spectrally threshold dominated is the characterization of split graphs and threshold graphs by their Ferrers diagram. Split graphs have the same number of boxes above

and on the diagonal as below the diagonal. Threshold graphs are special split graphs in that the shape below is the transposed of the shape above and on the diagonal. This forms the basis of the proof of the following lemma, which directly establishes Theorem 3.

Lemma 9 *Given a split graph G on n nodes with m edges and $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there is a threshold graph T on n nodes with m edges so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$.*

Proof Let $f(G) = \max\{i \colon d_i(G) \geq i\}$ be the trace of the Ferrers diagram for G. We discern the cases $k < f(G)$ and $k \geq f(G)$.



Figure 3: A transform for $k < f(G)$.

$k < f(G)$: leaving the boxes below the diagonal unchanged and by copying its shape in transposed form to the part above the diagonal we obtain a diagram uniquely defining a threshold graph T with the property $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$, where the last inequality follows from the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem. We refer to Figure 3 for an illustration of the graph transform. In the example $k = 2$ and the hatched box is moved.

Figure 4: A transform for $k \geq f(G)$.

$k \geq f(G)$: construct the desired threshold graph T by filling up the diagram above and on the diagonal in columnwise order by the m boxes, but only up to and including row $f(G)$ (and in rowwise order below the diagonal up to column $f(G)$ for the transposed shape). Thus $f(T) = f(G)$. Figure 4 shows the threshold graph T for a particular graph G. In the example the hatched boxes are moved. The construction never moves boxes across the diagonal.

First consider the case $k = f(G)$. Because the number of boxes below the diagonal is the same for G and T, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{f(G)} \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{f(G)} d_i^*(T) = m + f(G)(f(G)+1)/2 = \sum_{i=1}^{f(G)} d_i^*(G). \tag{3}$$

The claim follows from $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$ by the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem.

Finally, for $k > f(G)$ observe that for $j \in \{f(G)+1, \ldots, n\}$ there holds $\sum_{i=f(G)+1}^{j} d_i^*(T) \geq \sum_{i=f(G)+1}^{j} d_i^*(G)$, because in T the boxes have been rearranged to maximally fill up the first columns after column $f(G)$. Thus, equation (3) and the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem yield $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$. □

Note that the construction of the proof for $k \geq f(G)$ may generate a threshold graph that is not connected even if G is. Indeed, at this point we do not know how to construct for a general connected split graph G and given k a spectrally dominating connected threshold graph T_k.

4 Disjoint unions and complements preserve spectral threshold dominance

In order to increase the class of spectrally threshold dominated graphs a bit further, we consider taking the union and complements of spectrally threshold dominated graphs.

Lemma 10 *Let G be a (disjoint) union of spectrally threshold dominated graphs with n nodes and m edges and let $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. There is a threshold graph T on n nodes and m edges so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$.*

Before proving that the disjoint union of spectrally threshold dominated graphs $G_j = (N_j, \bar{E}_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, h$ is spectrally threshold dominated we first explain the main idea of the approach. For each $j = 1, \ldots, h$ put $n_j = |N_j|$ and suppose the eigenvalues of G_j are sorted non increasingly $\lambda_1(G_j) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{n_j}(G_j)$. The spectrum of the union $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^{h} G_j$ of the graphs is the union of the spectra of the graphs. Let the k largest eigenvalues of G arise from taking the k_j largest eigenvalues of G_j for $j = 1, \ldots, h$, then $k = \sum_{j=1}^{h} k_j$. If some graphs have identical eigenvalues, it does not matter which of them are selected. Because each G_j is spectrally dominated, there is a threshold graph $T_j = (N_j, E_j)$ with $|E_j| = |\bar{E}_j|$ so that its non decreasingly sorted dual degrees $d^*_{(j,i)} := d^*_i(T_j)$, which equal the eigenvalues $\lambda_i(T_j) = d^*_{(j,i)}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{k_j} d^*_{(j,i)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_j} \lambda_i(G_j)$. Therefore it suffices to consider $G_j = T_j$, take the k largest with respect to the sorting of the $d^*_{(j,i)} = \lambda_i(T_j)$ (this only increases the sum) and construct a threshold graph T with the same number of nodes and edges as $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^{h} T_j$ so that its non increasing dual degrees $d^*_i(T)$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{k} d^*_i(T) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{h} \sum_{i=1}^{k_j} d^*_{(j,i)}$. This T arises by the following simple construction of its Ferrers diagram. In column i the boxes below the diagonal are obtained by concatenating over all $j = 1, \ldots, h$ the boxes of column i that are below the diagonal of the diagram of T_j. The part above the diagonal is the corresponding transposed structure. In order to see that this graph actually dominates the sum of the k largest eigenvalues of G, an intermediate construction step is needed, where the columns of all the diagrams are arranged side by side and sorted by their height. Then, as illustrated in the example below, T arises from this diagram by only shifting boxes from higher column indices to lower column indices, so the sum of the boxes in the first k columns has to increase.





Unfortunately, the algebraic formulation of this geometrically intuitive observation requires an algorithmic description of the intermediate step and is therefore notationally more involved.

Proof (Lemma 10) We assume that $G = \bigcup_{j=1}^{h} G_j$ with each G_j spectrally threshold dominated. Let the first k eigenvalues of G consist of the first k_j eigenvalues of G_j, $j = 1, \ldots, h$ with $\sum_{j=1}^{h} k_j = k$. For each G_j there is threshold graph T_j so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k_j} \lambda_i(T_j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_j} \lambda_i(G_j)$. As seen above, it suffices to prove the result under the assumption that each G_j is a threshold graph $T_j = (N_j, E_j)$ with $n_j = |N_j|$, $m_j = |E_j|$ so that $\sum_{j=1}^{h} n_j = n$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{h} m_j = m$. Put $H = \{(j,i) : j \in \{1, \ldots, h\}, i \in \{1, \ldots, n_j\}\}$ with index (j,i) representing $d^*_{(j,i)} = d^*_i(T_j) = \lambda_i(T_j)$. Represent the ordering of the eigenvalues of G by a bijection

$$\sigma\colon \{1, \ldots, n\} \to H \text{ so that } d^*_{\sigma(p)} \geq d^*_{\sigma(q)} \text{ for } p \leq q \text{ and so that } i \leq q \text{ for } (j,i) = \sigma(q) \qquad (4)$$

(this is always possible, because the $d^*_i(T_j)$ are sorted nonincreasingly). Consider a diagram D_G having $d^*_{\sigma(i)}$ boxes in column i, then $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$ counts the boxes in columns one to k. The Ferrers diagram D_T of the intended threshold graph T will be obtained from D_G by only moving boxes to columns with smaller or equal index, then $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} d^*_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} d^*_{\sigma(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$.

For column $q = 1, \ldots, n$ in D_G and $(j,i) = \sigma(q)$ place the $d^*_i(T_j)$ boxes of this column by the following algorithm in the new diagram D_T. The box of row $r \in \{1, \ldots, \min\{i, d^*_i(T_j)\}\}$ is placed on or above the diagonal of D_T, concretely in row r in the next free column $c = q - |\{p \in \{1, \ldots, q-1\}\colon (\bar{\jmath}, \bar{\imath}) = \sigma(p) \wedge \bar{\imath} < r\}|$, thus (4) implies $r \leq c \leq q$; the box of row $r \in \{i+1, \ldots, d^*_i(T_j)\}$ is placed in column i (recall that $i \leq q$ by (4)) in the next free row $i + \sum_{(\bar{\jmath},\bar{\imath}) \in \{(\bar{\jmath},\bar{\imath}) = \sigma(p)\colon\, \bar{\imath} = i \wedge p \in \{1,\ldots,q-1\}\}} \max\{0, d^*_i(T_j) - i\} + (r - i)$, thus below the diagonal of D_T.

We complete the proof by showing that D_T is the Ferrers diagram of a threshold graph with trace $f = \max\{i\colon \exists (j,i) \in H \text{ with } d^*_i(T_j) > i\}$. Note that no boxes are placed on or

above the diagonal of D_T for rows $r > f$ (indeed, $d_i^*(T_j) \neq i$ for all threshold graphs T_j and i due to the transposed structure of their diagrams) and no boxes are placed below the diagonal for columns $c > f$. Column $c = 1, \ldots, f$ contains $\sum_{j=1}^{h} \max\{0, d_c^*(T_j) - c\}$ boxes below the diagonal. The number of boxes in row $r = 1, \ldots, f$ of D_T on or above the diagonal computes to $\sum_{j=1}^{h} |\{i \in \{r, \ldots, n_j\} \colon d_i^*(T_j) \geq r\}| = \sum_{j=1}^{h} \max\{0, d_r(T_j) - r + 1\} = \sum_{j=1}^{h} \max\{0, d_r^*(T_j) - r\}$, where the last equation uses the defining property $d_i^*(T_j) = d_i(T_j) + 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, f(T_j)$ (while $\max\{d_i^*(T_j), d_i(T_j)\} \leq f(T_j)$ for $i > f(T_j)$). Thus, for $c = r \in \{1, \ldots, f\}$ the counts coincide and D_T is the Ferrers diagram of a threshold graph T with $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$. $\square$

Forming the complement does not pose a problem as we show next.

Lemma 11 *Let G be a graph on n nodes with m edges and suppose that for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ there is a threshold graph T on n nodes and m edges so that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(T) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G)$. Then for the complement graphs $\bar{G}$ and $\bar{T}$ there holds $\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_i(\bar{T}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_i(\bar{G})$. Because of $\lambda_n = 0$ any threshold graph T having the same number of nodes and edges satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i(\bar{T}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i(\bar{G})$.*

Proof The equation $L(\bar{G}) = nI_n - \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top - L(G)$ gives rise to the well known relation $\lambda_i(\bar{G}) = n - \lambda_{n-i}(G)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ (and $\lambda_n(\bar{G}) = 0$ as usual). Because the sum of the eigenvalues of the Laplacian equals twice the number of edges of the graph, we get first $\sum_{i=k+1}^{n-1} \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_{n-i}(T) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_{n-i}(G)$ and then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_i(\bar{T}) = (n-k-1)n - \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_{n-i}(T) \geq (n-k-1)n - \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_{n-i}(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k-1} \lambda_i(\bar{G}). \square$$

The two previous lemmas establish Theorem 4.

Cographs are defined recursively as (i) K_1 is a cograph, (ii) the disjoint union of cographs is a cograph and (iii) the complement of a cograph is a cograph. Since K_1 is a threshold graph, in view of Lemmas 10 and 11 we have proved Corollary 5,

5 Equivalence with Brouwer's conjecture

In this section we prove that, together with the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem, Brouwer's conjecture is equivalent to conjecturing that every graph is spectrally threshold dominated. Since threshold graphs are known to satisfy Brouwer's conjecture, it is clear that any spectrally threshold dominated graph G satisfies Brouwer's conjecture. The core of the proof is therefore to construct for arbitrary n and $m \leq \binom{n}{2}$ a threshold graph that attains Brouwer's eigenvalue bound.

Proof (of Theorem 6) Note that by the Grone-Merris-Bai theorem Brouwer's conjecture is equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \lambda_i(G) \leq \min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\}$ holding for $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, because no conjugate degree exceeds n and the sum of all eigenvalues is $2m$.

Thus the equivalence is proven if for arbitrary $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ we show $\min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i^*(T) \colon T \text{ threshold graph on } n \text{ nodes and } m \text{ edges}\}$. Depending on the relation between k, n and m, we discern the following cases:

Case 1. $\min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = kn$: Consider the threshold graph T constructed by filling up the Ferrers diagram below the diagonal in columnwise order (on and above the

diagonal in corresponding rowwise order). The first k columns below the diagonal are fully filled because they require $kn - k(k+1)/2 \leq m$ boxes. Hence T satisfies $d_i^*(T) = n$ for $i = \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^*(T) = kn$. This is the maximum attainable over all threshold graphs on n nodes.

Case 2. $\min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = m + k(k+1)/2$: In this case put $h := \lfloor \frac{m}{k} + \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor < n$ and $r := m + k(k+1)/2 - kh < k$. Note that this implies $h \geq k+1$. Define a threshold graph T on n nodes with m edges of trace k by the conjugate degrees

$$d_i^*(T) = \begin{cases} h+1 & i \leq r, \\ h & r < i \leq k, \end{cases}$$

then $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^*(T) = m + k(k+1)/2$. This value cannot be exceeded by any threshold graph on n nodes with m edges by the Grone-Merris-Bai Majorization theorem, because in the Ferrers diagram of the conjugate degrees up to column k all boxes are used on and above the diagonal, while all possible m boxes are included below the diagonal.

Case 3. $\min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = 2m$: Put $h := \max\{h \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : h(h+1) \leq 2m\} < k$ and $r := (2m - h(h+1))/2 < h+1$, then the threshold graph T of trace h with conjugate degrees

$$d_i^*(T) = \begin{cases} h+2 & i \leq r, \\ h+1 & r < i \leq h, \\ r & i = h+1, \\ 0 & h+1 < i, \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i(T) = \sum_{i=1}^k d_i^*(T) = 2m$ and this is the maximum attainable over all threshold graphs with m edges. □



Figure 5: Graph for illustration of the equivalence

Example 12 *Consider the graph and its Ferrers diagram of Figure 5. There are $n = 8$ vertices and $m = 15$ edges. For $k = 1, 2$ we are in Case 1, for $k = 3, 4, 5$ it is Case 2 and for $k = 6, 7, 8$ we are in Case 3 of the theorem. We illustrate the construction of the threshold graphs T for which $\min\{kn, m+k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^k d_i^*(T) : T$ threshold graph on n nodes and m edges$\}$ in Figure 6 for $k = 2$, representing Case 1 (left), for $k = 4$, representing Case 2 with $h = 6, r = 1$ (center) and for $k = 7$, representing Case 3 with $h = 5, r = 0$ (right).*

We remark that in view of this result, whenever a class of graphs is shown to satisfy Brouwer's conjecture, the class also is spectrally threshold dominated and, in particular, the Laplacian energy is bounded by the Laplacian energy of threshold graphs.



Figure 6: Transforms for $\min\{kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m\} = kn, m + k(k+1)/2, 2m$

Corollary 13 *Trees, unicyclic and bicyclic graphs are spectrally threshold dominated.*

This follows from the fact that in [5], it is proven that trees satisfy Brouwer's conjecture. Likewise, in [3], it is proven that unicyclic and bicyclic graphs satisfy Brouwer's conjecture. Hence the Laplacian energy of these classes of graphs are also bounded by the Laplacian energy of threshold graphs. An explicit construction of a threshold graph on n nodes and m edges maximizing the Laplacian energy over all such threshold graphs is given in [6]. In the case of trees, it is known that the star on n vertices (a threshold graph) has largest Laplacian energy among all trees with n vertices [4]

In the same direction in [10] and in [12], it is proven that the conjecture of Brouwer holds for further classes of graphs.

Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by CAPES Grant PROBRAL 408/13 - Brazil and DAAD PROBRAL Grant 56267227 - Germany. Trevisan also acknowledges the support of CNPq - Grants 305583/2012-3 and 481551/2012-3.

References

[1] H. Bai. The Grone-Merris conjecture. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(8):4463–4474, 2011.

[2] R. Brualdi, L. Hogben, and B. Shader. AIM workshop spectra of families of matrices described by graphs, digraphs, and sign patterns final report: Mathematical results (revised). http://aimath.org/pastworkshops/matrixspectrumrep.pdf/, March 2007. (Last accessed 04.01.2014).

[3] Z. Du and B. Zhou. Upper bounds for the sum of Laplacian eigenvalues of graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 436(9):3672 – 3683, 2012.

[4] E. Fritscher, C. Hoppen, I. Rocha, and V. Trevisan. On the sum of the Laplacian eigenvalues of a tree. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 435(2):371 – 399, 2011.

[5] W. Haemers, A. Mohammadian, and B. Tayfeh-Rezaie. On the sum of Laplacian eigenvalues of graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 432(9):2214 – 2221, 2010.

[6] C. Helmberg and V. Trevisan. Threshold graphs of maximal Laplacian energy. *Discrete Mathemathics*, 338:1075–1084, 2015.

[7] Mayank. On variants of the Grone-Merris conjecture. Master's thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Eindhoven, The Netherlands, November 2010.

[8] R. Merris. Degree maximal graphs are Laplacian integral. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 199:381–389, 1994.

[9] R. Merris and T. Roby. The lattice of threshold graphs. *Journal of Inequalities in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 6(1):Art. 2, 2005. `http://jipam.vu.edu.au/`.

[10] I. Rocha and V. Trevisan. Bounding the sum of the largest Laplacian eigenvalues of graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 170(0):95 – 103, 2014.

[11] C. Vinagre, R. Del-Vecchio, D. Justo, and V. Trevisan. Maximum Laplacian energy among threshold graphs. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 439(5):1479–1495, 2013.

[12] S. Wang, Y. Huang, and B. Liu. On a conjecture for the sum of Laplacian eigenvalues. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 56(3-4):60 – 68, 2012.